

Report No. 21
Income
2006
Report No. 21
Income
2006

**NATIONAL
CENSUS
TEST**

**TEST DU
RECENSEMENT
NATIONAL**

Report No. 21

Questions 43, 44, 45: Income

Canada

ANALYSIS OF INCOME COMPONENTS
1988 NATIONAL CENSUS TEST

JULY, 1989
LABOUR AND HOUSEHOLD
SURVEYS ANALYSIS DIVISION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
I. INTRODUCTION.....	2
II. WAGE RATE QUESTIONS.....	3
III. WAGE RATE UNIVERSE.....	4
IV. EFFECTIVENESS OF Q44 - WAGE RATE FILTER QUESTION.....	5
V. COMPARISON WITH MT-1.....	10
VI. AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE.....	12
VII. HOURLY WAGE SIZE DISTRIBUTION.....	13
VIII. INCOME IN 1987.....	14
IX. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	17

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The wage rate filter question should include a qualifier for those working for tips, commissions or bonuses.
2. The current format for the wage rate question, with some minor modifications, appears satisfactory.
3. A question on normal weekly hours must be present in order to fully process all respondent provided data.
4. In addition to designing a module to edit and impute current hourly wage rate, some inter-variable edits with labour force variables must be implemented to ensure consistent data.
5. Detailed specifications for ROP or HOP processing of write-ins against "other pay period" must be designed and their most effective location determined.
6. The questions on current wage rate do not seem to have an adverse impact on reporting of annual income sources.

I. INTRODUCTION

In preparation for the 1991 Census, a series of tests has been undertaken to examine the feasibility of various questions. The National Census Test (NCT), conducted in November, 1988, contained eleven questions on sources of income and two questions to obtain information on current hourly wage rates.

The questions on annual income were included to test whether the question on wage rate would have any adverse impact on the response to the annual wage or other income questions.

The primary objective was to assess the response, incidence rates and quality of data on wage rates.

II. WAGE RATE QUESTIONS (Q.44 and Q.45)

The wage rate questions were also included in an earlier test (MT-1). In the MT-1, respondents currently working for a wage or salary were asked, in a three part question, to report (a) their current hourly wage rate, if possible, otherwise (b) their gross wage or salary and the associated pay period and (c) their normal weekly hours. The changes on the NCT questionnaire were as follows:

- a filter question identifying those currently working for a wage or salary was added;

- a separate amount space was provided for each reporting period;
- the question on normal weekly hours was inadvertently dropped.

Thus, the 1988 National Census Test (NCT) asked the two following questions on current wage rate of those working for wages or a salary.

CURRENT PAY RATE

44. Is this person currently working for a wage or salary?

45. What is this person's usual hourly wage before taxes and other deductions?

If this person holds more than one job, answer for the job at which the most hours are worked.

OR

If unable to provide an hourly wage, then this person should report:

- the usual pay period, that is, how often paid,
and
- the usual gross salary for the period indicated.

1 No
Skip to Step 8

2 Yes

Dollars Cents
 per hour

OR

Check one period and give corresponding amount:

3 per week

Dollars Cents

4 every two weeks

Dollars Cents

5 per month

Dollars Cents

6 per year

Dollars Cents

7 other - Specify
Period

Dollars Cents

III. WAGE RATE UNIVERSE

A total of 27,286 individuals answered "YES" to Q.44. Another 1,044 who answered "NO" to Q.44 or left it blank but provided an amount in Q.45 were also accepted as "working for a wage or salary". Thus, the total universe to be examined consisted of 28,330 individuals.

The percentage distribution of these individuals by reporting period, along with a similar distribution from the MT-1 is shown in Table 1.

The large percentage increase in those reporting hourly wage amounts, as well as the large decrease in the reporting of an annual amount, as compared to the MT-1 is encouraging. It is also an indication that the currently formatted question is superior to the MT-1 version in eliciting hourly wage rate response.

Although just over 1% of respondents completed the write-in space against "other pay period", this will translate into a large number of questionnaires in 1991 that will have to be examined manually and coded or corrected in either ROP or HOP. About 40% of these respondents could have reported against one of the pre-coded periods. As well, it appears that there could be an added clarifying instruction for those reporting every two weeks, bi-monthly or fortnightly to use the period "every two weeks".

IV. EFFECTIVENESS OF Q.44- WAGE RATE FILTER QUESTION

In the 1988 NCT two questions were asked on current pay rate. The first question, basically a filter question, asked of the population 15 years and over, "Is this person currently working for a wage or salary?". Persons answering "NO" were instructed to skip the question on wage rates; persons answering "YES" were to provide an hourly wage rate if possible, otherwise report a wage value for one of the selected pay periods. Overall response to this question was very good; only 4.1% of the population left this question blank. About 49% answered "NO" and 47% responded "YES". See Table 2 for a breakdown of response to this question by sex.

The accuracy of the response to the screening question can be judged by examining labour force characteristics of individuals in the selected wage rate universe (all those who answered "YES" or provided a wage rate amount) and some characteristics of those who answered "NO". This examination will also give us an idea of the types and extent of edits necessary for the final data product to be as internally consistent as possible.

The three main labour force questions considered for this purpose are Q.30 on current employment status and Q.37 and Q.38 from which we derived a class of worker variable.

From the results shown in tables 3A and 3B, of the 28,330 individuals in the wage rate universe:

--25,712 (90.8%) answered "YES" and reported a wage rate, of which

--23,448 were currently employed paid workers. These individuals have provided consistent information.

--513 were paid workers who indicated they were not currently employed. These individuals have either provided a wage rate for a job they no longer hold or have answered Q.30 incorrectly. These individuals have provided inconsistent information.

--579 individuals indicated that they were self-employed or an unpaid family worker. These individuals have either an erroneous class of worker variable or should not have reported a wage rate.(especially those marking 'currently employed') They have provided inconsistent information.

--The rest of this group, 1172 individuals, left either their current employment status question blank and/or their class of worker questions blank. Because of a lack of essential information records of this type can neither be classified as consistent nor inconsistent.

--850 (3.0%) answered "NO" and reported a wage rate.

--All of these responses can be considered as inconsistent information however,

--198 of these individuals were currently employed paid workers. My assumption is that after answering a series of YES-NO questions, it is possible that they inadvertently checked the "NO" box when they encountered the NO-YES format of Q.44.

--The rest of this group consists of those who have provided obviously inconsistent information--most notably the 410 paid workers who were not currently employed, or those who were self-employed or unpaid family workers.

--188 (0.7%) left the filter question blank and reported a wage rate, of which

--138 were currently employed paid workers and have obviously just skipped answering the filter question. This information can be considered consistent.

--30 were paid workers not currently employed, self-employed or unpaid family workers. Their responses can be considered inconsistent.

--20 who left their current employment status and/or their class of worker questions blank.

--1574 (5.6%) individuals who checked the "YES" box but did not provide a wage rate value, of which

--1252 were currently employed paid workers. The information is consistent (albeit incomplete)

--37 paid workers who were not currently employed or left their current employment status blank. Their information is inconsistent.

--87 self-employed or unpaid family workers. The indication of a wage rate is inconsistent.

--198 who did not respond to the class of worker questions.

Thus, the effectiveness of Q.44 as a wage rate filter question can be measured by examining consistent and inconsistent responses. The results are summarized in Table 4. It should be considered only a 'rough' estimate as other data provided has not been considered. For example, responses to the annual wage rate question, occupation, industry etc. could all have a bearing on interpretation of response to the wage rate question. Complementing the data in Table 4 are the responses to the wage rate filter question by persons 15 years and over who were not in the selected wage rate universe. These 'NO' and BLANK responses to Q.44 have also been examined by class of worker and current employment status.(See tables 5A and 5B) The same type of interpretations as to consistency of response can be applied,i.e.,

CONSISTENT RESPONSE--86.2%

- Paid workers not currently employed answering 'NO' (5,429)
- Self-employed or Unpaid family workers answering 'NO' (2,697)
- Other C.O.W. not currently employed answering 'NO' (14,625)

INCONSISTENT RESPONSE--5.4%

- Paid workers currently employed answering 'NO' (1,125). A quick scan of this group by occupation write-in reveals that some of these individuals are in types of jobs that pay on a commission, per job, or other type of payment schedule that does not lend itself to hourly reporting. These individuals, however, could have reported against "other" pay period. This may indicate a problem in interpretation of "currently working for a wage or salary".

INDETERMINATE RESPONSE--8.4%

- All other responses including blank response to Q.44 and/or blank current employment status and/or blank response to C.O.W. questions (3,261).

Combining the responses to Q.44 for the total population 15 years and over shows that 86.2% of the responses are internally consistent, 5.4% are inconsistent and 8.4% are indeterminate. Some of the paid workers classified as "inconsistent" appear to be in occupations that pay on an irregular basis. A further instruction to include yourself if working for tips, commissions or bonuses may be of some benefit for this group.

V. Comparison With MT-1

In the evaluation of the NCT response to the wage rate questions, data similar to that examined in the MT-1 was retrieved. These comparisons were restricted to Paid Workers. The percentage distribution of these two groups of individuals by their response to the wage rate question is shown in Table 6.

In the 1987 MT-1 test, there were 3543 paid workers 15 years and over. Approximately 73% of these individuals provided an amount response to the wage rate question. In the 1988 NCT, there were 33,147 paid workers (unweighted). Just over 75% of these paid workers provided an amount response to the wage rate questions. The amount response to the wage rate question in both tests is quite similar. However, because of the wage rate filter question on the NCT the responses of those not reporting a wage rate can be examined more closely. A percentage distribution of paid workers in the NCT, by sex and combined response to Q.44 and Q.45 is shown in Table 7.

While it seems unusual that 20% of paid workers would answer 'NO' to currently working for a wage or salary, further investigation reveals that this group contains paid workers so designated because they have reported for their job 'of longest duration since Jan., 1987'. Furthermore, about 11% of paid workers who were non-respondents to the wage rate question in the MT-1 indicated, in a follow-up interview, that they in fact were not working for a wage or salary.

Of the 7,259 paid workers who answered 'NO' to the wage rate question, 622 provided a wage rate value and are included with those reporting a wage rate. Of the remaining 6,637 paid workers, 5,839 (88%) reported in question 30 on current employment status that they were not currently working. Therefore, for most of this group, the answer 'NO' to the wage rate question is consistent.

The NCT, unlike the MT-1, also asked the following question (Q30), "Is this person currently employed?". By combining response to this question with a derived class of worker variable, we are able to isolate the "currently employed paid workers", i.e. those who should have provided a response for the wage rate question. Table 8 shows the percentage distribution of this group by their response to the wage rate question.

This further delineation of paid workers eliminates those who correctly answered the "class of worker questions", but are not currently employed. The response rate for this group is very encouraging.

Thus, it seems clear that, in spite of the very low non-response for this group, some inter-variable editing will be required between the labour force variables and the wage rate variables to ensure consistency.

VI. AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE

The 1988 NCT did not contain a question on usual or normal weekly hours. Therefore, no hourly wage could be derived for those reporting wages for one of the other pay periods on the questionnaire. For this reason, all of the following comparisons include only those reporting an hourly wage in the NCT. The data from the Labour Market Activity Survey (LMA) consists of all those paid workers (excluding self employed in incorporated companies) who provided wage data.

The average hourly wage derived from the NCT was compared to inflation adjusted hourly wage rates from the 1986 LMA. These averages (both weighted and unweighted) are provided in Table 9. The table shows calculated averages only for those reporting less than \$100.00 per hour. Since the NCT data was neither manually examined nor subjected to an edit procedure the use of these averages is likely to exclude most of the erroneous outliers. (The NCT overall weighted average hourly wage, at \$11.95, is 4% greater than the LMA average of \$11.49.) For those with wages under \$100/hr. the NCT average hourly wage of \$11.20 is 1.9% lower than the comparative LMA average of \$11.42. The NCT average hourly wage for males in this group is \$12.80, 1.0% lower than the comparative LMA average of \$12.93. The difference in the average hourly wage for females is slightly larger, with the NCT average of \$9.32 being 3.1% lower than the LMA average of \$9.62.

VII. HOURLY WAGE SIZE DISTRIBUTION

Table 10 provides a percentage distribution of hourly wage respondents by sex and hourly wage size groups. As with the comparison of averages, the NCT distributions are for those reporting hourly wages only. The LMA distributions are for all wage respondents.

The distributions show that the NCT has 5.9 percentage points fewer respondents in groups under \$5/hr., about an equal percentage of respondents between \$5 and \$10/hr., 5.9% points more respondents between \$10 and \$15/hr., 2.3% points more between \$15 and \$20/hr. and 1.9% points fewer respondents at \$20/hr. or more.

The differences are even larger in the male and female distributions. The LMA has proportionately 7.8% more males in groups under \$10/hr., while the NCT has 7.1% larger concentration in the \$10 - \$15/hr. groups. The LMA has slightly higher concentrations than the NCT in the groups between \$20 and \$50/hr., but relatively fewer with a wage rate greater than \$50/hr.

Although the NCT and the LMA show about 88% of females with an hourly wage rate under \$15/hr., there are differences in the distributions, especially between \$4 and \$5/hr. Within this range in the LMA are 14.8% of the females, while the NCT shows only 10.1%. The LMA also shows 3.3 higher percentage points in the group of females with wages under \$4/hr. The NCT, on the other hand, has, relatively, 4.5% more females in wage size groups between \$10 and

\$15/hr. than does the LMA.

The overall picture of both the distributions is quite similar. Both distributions show reporting of wages below minimum wage. It is possible that some "net" reporting is occurring; there may also be some self-employed (such as babysitters, newspaper carriers, etc.) reporting income as wages, while some individuals working for piece rates may be reporting very low hourly wages.

VIII. INCOME IN 1987

The 1988 NCT repeated the eleven questions on annual income sources asked in the 1986 Census. The major reason for including these questions in the NCT was to observe if the new wage rate question had an adverse impact on the reporting of annual wages. However, since the annual income questions were not subject to a mandatory follow-up, as was the wage rate question, only a subjective estimate, based on debriefing comments and analysis of non-response and incidence rates, can be made.

In the course of NCT processing, a procedure was adopted to individual records according to their overall response status of each individual record (RC codes 1-99). To the extent possible this procedure duplicated the 1986 Census experience, dividing the records into three broad groups: complete response to the income questions; partial response to one or more sources or total income; and total non-response.

Overall non-response in the NCT is, as expected, higher than in the 1986 Census. For a distribution of response and non-response rates by age groups in the NCT, see Table 11. The high non-response in the youngest age groups is a pattern similar to both sources. Non-response is substantially higher in the 15-19 age group, for both males and females, and is lowest in the age groups 65 years and over. Additionally, partial response is highest among the elderly which indicates that they, more so than other age groups, may have had recall problems in reporting calendar year data for 1987. According to the debriefing reports, the elderly experienced some difficulty in completing the test questionnaire.

The generally low response rate to the annual income questions must be viewed in light of the following factors.

1. There was no public relations effort accompanying the NCT, as would be the case in an actual Census.
2. There was no field follow-up to the annual income questions in the NCT.
3. The time lag between the income reference period (1987 calendar year) and the date of the test, (November, 1988) was quite long.

The incidence of the income sources was also calculated and compared with similar data from the 1986 Census load base. See Table 12 for this comparison. Other than the incidence of wages, investment income and total income, which are substantially lower

in the NCT, the incidence rates for the other sources are quite similar to those recorded in the 1986 Census.

Although the incidence of wages is lower in comparison with the 1986 Census, this does not necessarily indicate that the wage rate question has affected response to the annual question. It must be kept in mind that the incidence of total income in the NCT is substantially lower than expected in the Census. In the 1986 Census, about 70% of income recipients have wages. Thus, at least some non-response to the annual wage question, as well as to the other sources, is a function of general non-response. Furthermore, on the one hand, of the 25,000 individuals reporting annual wages, 99.7% responded to the wage rate question. On the other hand, of the 26,200 paid workers who responded to the wage rate question, about 19,400 (75%) reported annual wages. To ascertain the extent to which this group may contain recently employed individuals, who legitimately have zero wages in 1987, the number of weeks worked in 1987 was examined. Just over three quarters of this group reported some work activity in 1987. However, it is difficult to infer or imply an effect of the presence of annual wages and wage rate questions.

LIST OF TABLES

- I. Percentage Distribution of Wage Respondents by Reporting Period, NCT and MT-1.
- II. Population 15 Years and Over By Response to Wage Rate Filter Question (Q44), NCT.
- IIIa. Distribution of Population 15 Years and Over in Wage Rate Universe by Type of Response to Wage Rate Questions, Class of Worker and Current Employment Status, NCT.
- IIIb. Percentage Distribution of Population 15 Years and Over in Wage Rate Universe by Type of Response to Wage Rate Questions, Class of Worker and Current Employment Status, NCT.
- IV. Distribution of Population in Wage Rate Universe by Consistency of Response to Wage Rate Filter Question.
- Va. Distribution of Population 15 Years and Over Not In Wage Rate Universe By Type of Response to Wage Rate Questions, Class of Worker and Current Employment Status, NCT.
- Vb. Percentage Distribution of Population 15 Years and Over Not In Wage Rate Universe By Type of Response to Wage Rate Questions, Class of Worker and Current Employment Status, NCT.
- VI. Percentage Distribution of Paid Workers By Sex and Response to Wage Rate Questions, NCT and MT-1.
- VII. Percentage Distribution of Paid Workers by Response to Wage Rate Questions, NCT.
- VIII. Percentage Distribution of Currently Employed Paid Workers by Response to Wage Rate Questions, NCT.
- IX. Average Hourly Wage Rates, By Sex, Showing Sample and Weighted Averages and Counts, LMA and NCT.
- X. Percentage Distribution of Hourly Wage Respondents in Constant (Nov. 1988) Dollars, 1986 Labour Market Analysis Survey (Weighted) and National Census Test (Weighted)
- XI. Percentage Distribution of Population 15 and Over by Age Groups and Response to Income Questions, NCT.
- XII. Incidence of Income, by Source, for the Sample Population 15 Years and Over, NCT and 1986 Census.

Table 1. Percentage Distribution of Wage Respondents by Reporting Period, NCT and MT-1

Reporting Period	NCT	MT-1
		%
HOURLY	58.0	44.5
WEEKLY	7.0	13.4
FORTNIGHTLY	11.2	12.3
MONTHLY	9.2	7.0
ANNUAL	5.4	16.4
OTHER	3.6(1)	0.5
TOTAL WAGES REPORTED	94.4	92.2
YES ONLY	5.6	7.8(2)
TOTAL	100.0	100.0
SAMPLE SIZE	28,330	3,045

(1) Contains 696 respondents to the "Weekly/Fortnightly/Monthly" questions whose reporting period could not be identified because of processing restrictions. This group alone makes up 2.6% of the sample.

(2) Contains those reporting wage period only and those reporting wage amount but no period

Table 2. Population 15 Years And Over By Response To Wage Rate Filter Question (Q.44), NCT

Response To Q.44	Male		Female		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Answered "YES"	15,069	55.6	12,217	43.1	27,286	49.2
Answered "NO"	11,080	40.9	14,847	52.4	25,927	46.7
Respondents	26,149	96.4	27,064	95.5	53,213	95.9
Non-Respondents	968	3.6	1,286	4.5	2,254	4.1
Total	27,117	100.0	28,350	100.0	55,467	100.0

TABLE 3A. DISTRIBUTION OF POP. 15+ IN WAGE RATE UNIVERSE BY TYPE OF RESPONSE TO WAGE RATE QUESTIONS,
CLASS OF WORKER AND CURRENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS, N.C.T.

RESPONSE TO WAGE RATE QUESTIONS	PAID WORKERS				BENP/BEP/UPW				OTHER C.O.W.				
	TOTAL	CURRENTLY EMPLOYED	NOT EMPLOYED	BLANK EMP. STATUS	TOTAL	CURRENTLY EMPLOYED	NOT EMPLOYED	BLANK EMP. STATUS	TOTAL	CURRENTLY EMPLOYED	NOT EMPLOYED	BLANK EMP. STATUS	TOTAL
ANSWERED "YES" AND REPORTED WAGE RATE	25,712	23,448	513	152	24,113	554	20	5	37	540	118	362	1,020
ANSWERED "NO" AND REPORTED WAGE RATE	854	198	410	14	622	102	34	2	136	11	77	8	96
BLANK AND REPORTED WAGE RATE	100	138	18	5	161	11	1	0	12	5	3	7	15
SUBTOTAL: REPORTED WAGE RATE	26,756	23,784	941	171	24,896	667	55	7	729	556	196	377	1,131
ANSWERED "YES" ONLY	1,574	1,252	51	6	1,209	85	2	0	87	89	18	91	198
TOTAL	28,330	25,036	972	177	26,185	752	57	7	816	645	216	468	1,329

TABLE 58. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF POP. 15+ IN WAGE RATE UNIVERSE BY TYPE OF RESPONSE TO WAGE RATE QUESTIONS,
CLASS OF WORKER AND CURRENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS, N.C.T.

RESPONSE TO WAGE RATE QUESTIONS	PAID WORKERS					SELF/NEF/UFM					OTHER C.O.W.				
	TOTAL	CURRENTLY EMPLOYED	NOT EMPLOYED	BLANK EMP. STATUS	TOTAL	CURRENTLY EMPLOYED	NOT EMPLOYED	BLANK EMP. STATUS	TOTAL	CURRENTLY EMPLOYED	NOT EMPLOYED	BLANK EMP. STATUS	TOTAL		
ANSWERED "YES" AND REPORTED WAGE RATE	90.8	82.8	1.8	0.5	85.1	2.0	0.1	0.0	2.0	1.9	0.4	1.3	3.6		
ANSWERED "NO" AND REPORTED WAGE RATE	3.0	0.7	1.4	0.0	2.2	0.4	0.1	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.3		
BLANK AND REPORTED WAGE RATE	0.7	0.5	0.1	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1		
(SUBTOTAL) REPORTED WAGE RATE	94.4	84.0	3.3	0.6	87.9	2.4	0.2	0.0	2.6	2.0	0.7	1.3	4.0		
ANSWERED "YES" ONLY	5.6	4.4	0.1	0.0	4.5	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.7		
TOTAL	100.0	88.4	3.4	0.6	92.4	2.7	0.2	0.0	2.9	2.3	0.8	1.7	4.7		

Table 4. Distribution of Population in Wage Rate Universe by
Consistency of Response to Wage Rate Filter Question

WAGE RATE UNIVERSE	NUMBER	PERCENT
Answered 'YES' to Q44	27,286	98.2
Consistent	24,700	87.2
Inconsistent	1,210	4.3
Indeterminate	1,376	4.9
Answered 'NO' to Q44 and		
Reported Wage Rate	856	3.0
Consistent	198	.7
Inconsistent	658	2.3
Indeterminate	0	0.0
Left Q.44 Blank and		
Reported Wage Rate	188	.7
Consistent	138	.5
Inconsistent	30	.1
Indeterminate	20	.1
Total	28,330	100.0
Consistent	25,036	88.4
Inconsistent	1,898	6.7
Indeterminate	1,396	4.9

TABLE 5A DISTRIBUTION OF POP. 15+ NOT IN WAGE RATE UNIVERSE BY TYPE OF RESPONSE TO WAGE RATE QUESTIONS,
CLASS OF WORKER AND CURRENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS, N.C.T.

RESPONSE	TOTAL	PAID WORKERS			SELF-REF/PU			OTHER C.O.U.			TOTAL	
		CURRENTLY EMPLOYED	NOT EMPLOYED	BLANK EMP. STATUS	TOTAL	CURRENTLY EMPLOYED	NOT EMPLOYED	BLANK EMP. STATUS	TOTAL	CURRENTLY EMPLOYED	NOT EMPLOYED	
ANSWERED "NO" AND DID NOT REPORT WAGE RATE	25,071	1,125	5,429	83	6,637	1,937	679	81	2,697	237	14,625	875 15,737
BLANK AND DID NOT REPORT WAGE RATE	2,066	231	82	12	325	30	9	2	41	102	899	899 1,700
TOTAL	27,137	1,356	5,511	95	6,962	1,967	688	83	2,738	339	15,524	1,774 17,437

TABLE 58 PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF POP. 15+ NOT IN WAGE RATE UNIVERSE BY TYPE OF RESPONSE TO WAGE RATE QUESTIONS, CLASS OF WORKER AND CURRENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS, N.C.T.

RESPONSE	TOTAL	PAID WORKERS			TOTAL	BENF/REF/UV			TOTAL	OTHER C.O.W.			TOTAL
		CURRENTLY EMPLOYED	NOT EMPLOYED	BLANK EMP. STATUS		CURRENTLY EMPLOYED	NOT EMPLOYED	BLANK EMP. STATUS		CURRENTLY EMPLOYED	NOT EMPLOYED	BLANK EMP. STATUS	
ANSWERED "NO" AND DID NOT REPORT WAGE RATE	92.4	4.1	20.0	0.3	24.5	7.1	2.5	0.3	9.9	0.9	53.9	3.2	57.9
BLANK AND DID NOT REPORT WAGE RATE	7.6	0.9	0.3	0.0	1.2	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.4	3.3	2.6	6.2
TOTAL	100.0	5.0	20.3	0.4	25.7	7.2	2.5	0.3	10.1	1.2	57.2	5.6	64.2

TABLE 6. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF PAID WORKERS (1) (SAMPLE) BY SEX AND RESPONSE TO WAGE RATE QUESTIONS, NCT AND MT-1.

RESPONSE TO WAGE RATE QUESTION	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	NCT	MT-1	NCT	MT-1	NCT	MT-1
POPULATION	17,968	1,836	15,179	1,660	33,147	3,496
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
REPORTED \$ VALUE WAGE RATE	76.0	73.7	74.0	71.6	75.1	72.7
PARTIAL RESPONDENTS(2)	4.4	5.2	3.3	5.7	3.9	5.4
NON-RESPONDENTS(3)	19.7	21.0	22.6	25.4	21.0	23.1

NOTE:(1) Paid workers determined by response to the question: "In this job, was this person mainly working for wages, salary, tips or commission?" or self-employed in incorporated companies.

(2) Partial respondents in the NCT are comprised of those who answered "Yes" to Q44, but did not provide a wage rate value. Partial respondents in the MT-1 include those who checked a wage rate period, but provided no amount, and those who provided an amount without indicating the corresponding period.

(3) Non-respondents in the MT-1 are paid workers who did not answer the wage rate question. In the NCT, they are comprised of those who either answered "No" to Q44 or left the wage rate question blank.

Table 7. Percentage Distribution of Paid Workers by Response
to Wage Rate Questions, NCT

Response to Q44/45	Paid Workers		
	Male	Female	Total
%			
Wage Rate Reported	76.0	74.1	75.1
Answered "Yes" to Q44 (Wage rate not reported)	4.4	3.3	3.9
Not Working For Wages	18.7	21.5	20.0
Non-Respondent	0.9	1.0	1.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Sample Size	17,968	15,179	33,147

Source: 1988 National Census Test

Table 8. Percentage Distribution of Currently Employed Paid Workers by Response to Wage Rate Questions, NCT

Response to Q44/45	Currently Employed Paid Workers		
	Male	Female	Total
%			
Reported Wage Rate	88.8	91.8	90.1
Answered "Yes" to Q44- (Wage rate not reported)	5.2	4.1	4.7
Not Working For Wages	5.1	3.2	4.3
Non-Respondent	0.9	0.9	0.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Sample Size	14,684	11,708	26,392

Source: 1988 National Census Test

TABLE 9. AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE RATES(1), BY SEX, SHOWING SAMPLE AND WEIGHTED AVERAGES(1) AND COUNTS, 1986 LMA AND 1988 NCT

	SAMPLE		WEIGHTED	
	LMA	N.C.T.	LMA	N.C.T.
Male				
Average Hourly Wage	12.33	12.46	12.93	12.80
Count	23,265	8,781	6,428,291	3,339,615
Female				
Average Hourly Wage	9.12	8.99	9.62	9.32
Count	19,977	7,621	5,403,935	2,826,293
Both Sexes				
Average Hourly Wage	10.85	10.85	11.42	11.20
Count	43,242	16,402	11,832,226	6,165,908

TABLE 10. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF HOURLY WAGE RESPONDENTS IN CONSTANT (NOV. 1988) DOLLARS,
1986 LABOUR MARKET ANALYSIS SURVEY (WEIGHTED) AND NATIONAL CENSUS TEST (WEIGHTED)

HOURLY WAGE SIZE GROUP	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	LMAS	NCT	LMAS	NCT	LMAS	NCT
LESS \$1.00	0.2	-	0.2	-	0.2	-
1.00-1.49	0.2	-	0.4	0.1	0.3	0.1
1.50-1.99	0.3	0.1	0.4	0.1	0.3	0.1
2.00-2.49	0.3	-	0.6	0.1	0.4	0.1
2.50-2.99	0.3	-	0.5	0.2	0.4	0.1
3.00-3.49	0.4	0.1	0.8	0.2	0.6	0.1
3.50-3.99	1.0	3.0	1.9	0.8	1.4	0.5
4.00-4.49	3.3	1.3	6.9	3.3	4.9	2.2
4.50-4.99	3.5	3.3	7.9	6.8	5.5	4.9
5.00-5.99	7.4	5.2	13.3	13.6	10.1	9.1
6.00-6.99	5.4	4.6	8.1	10.1	6.7	7.1
7.00-7.99	6.1	5.2	8.9	9.1	7.4	7.0
8.00-8.99	6.6	6.2	8.2	9.0	7.4	7.5
9.00-9.99	6.0	5.9	7.3	8.6	6.6	7.1
10.00-12.49	15.6	19.3	14.6	19.2	15.1	19.2
12.50-14.99	12.6	16.0	7.7	7.6	10.3	12.1
15.00-19.99	18.8	22.9	8.3	8.6	14.0	16.3
20.00-24.99	7.3	6.2	2.1	1.4	4.9	4.0
25.00-29.99	2.2	1.8	0.6	0.5	1.5	1.2
30.00-39.99	1.2	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.9	0.6
40.00-49.99	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.1
50.00 OR MORE	0.1	0.7	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.5
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
SAMPLE SIZE	6,429,290	3,350,391	5,406,254	2,829,737	11,835,544	6,180,129

Table 11. Percentage Distribution of Population 15 and Over
by Age Groups and Response to Income Questions, NCT

Response Type	Age Groups			Total
	15-24	25-64	65+	
Respondents	55.6	64.8	63.8	62.9
Partial Respondents	1.7	3.1	7.6	3.5
Non-Respondents	42.8	32.2	28.6	33.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Sample Size	10,168	37,229	8,070	55,467

Table 12. Incidence of Income, by Source, for the Sample Population 15 Years and Over, 1988 National Census Test and 1986 Census.

INCOME SOURCE	INCIDENCE			
	Among Population 15 Years and Over		Among income recipients	
	NCT	CENSUS	NCT	CENSUS %
Wages and Salaries	45.1	54.7	84.0	78.3
Non-Farm Self-Empl. Income	3.3	3.3	6.2	4.7
Farm Self-Empl. Income	2.5	1.7	4.6	2.4
OAS-GIS Pensions	10.3	10.4	19.2	14.9
C/QPP Benefits	9.1	8.4	16.9	12.1
UI Benefits	7.7	9.7	14.3	13.8
Other Govt. Transfers	6.0	8.1	11.2	11.6
Investment Income	17.4	23.2	32.4	33.3
Retirement Pension	5.1	5.3	9.6	7.6
Other Income	2.3	2.9	4.2	4.1
TOTAL INCOME	53.7	69.9	100.0	100.0
SAMPLE	4,093,437		4,063,016	

c.2

STATISTICS CANADA LIBRARY
BIBLIOTHÈQUE STATISTIQUE CANADA



1010343854

